

34. (Original) A computer readable program according to claim 28,
wherein said desired data file is a text file.

35. (Original) A computer readable program according to claim 29,
wherein boundaries among said divided areas are blurred after the lightness or saturation of one
or a plurality of pixels in each of said divided areas is changed.

36. (Original) A computer readable program according to claim 34,
wherein all or part of the contents of said text file is displayed in the form of text in such a
manner as to be overlapped to said image information.

REMARKS

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 2-9, 11-18, 20-27, and 29-36 and amended claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 are in this application.

Claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Enokida et al. (US Patent No. 6,335,746).

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, is directed to a displaying method for displaying image information. The displaying method includes the step of "generating image data corresponding to a mode corresponding to said data file...." (Underlining and bold added)

for emphasis.) It is respectfully submitted the portions of Enokida relied upon by the Examiner (hereinafter "Enokida") do not specifically disclose such generating image data step of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Enokida.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to amended independent claim 1, amended independent claims 10, 19, and 28 are also believed to be distinguishable from Enokida.

Claims 6, 7, 15, 16, 24, 25, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enokida et al. in view of Takemoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,742).

Claims 6, 7, 15, 16, 24, 25, 33, and 34 are dependent from one of claims 1, 10, 19, and 28, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Enokida for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on Takemoto to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Enokida. Accordingly, claims 6, 7, 15, 16, 24, 25, 33, and 34 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Enokida and Takemoto for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17, 18, 20-23, 26, 27, 29-32, 35, and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's assertion that these claims contain allowable subject matter. Amended independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 (from which claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17, 18, 20-23, 26, 27, 29-32, 35, and 36 depend) are believed to be distinguishable over the prior art relied upon by the Examiner as discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17, 18, 20-23, 26, 27, 29-32, 35, and 36 is respectfully requested.


The Examiner has made of record, but not applied, several U.S. patents. The applicants appreciate the Examiner's explicit finding that these references, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.

It is to be appreciated that the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art represent the present opinions of the Applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:


Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800